

Appl. No. 10/531,753
Amdt. Dated June 1, 2009
Reply to Office action of March 31, 2009
Attorney Docket No. P17299-US1
EUS/GJ/P/09-1127

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 13-16 and 18-21 as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,170) in view of Alkhatib, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0044778) and Lim, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5884024); and claims 17 and 22 as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Alkhatib and Taylor, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0065919). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

In the prior office action, the Examiner rejected claim 13-16 and 18-21 as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Alkhatib, and claims 17 and 22 as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Alkhatib and Taylor. In the present office action, the Examiner has merely added the teachings of Lim to his stated basis of rejection of claims 13-16 and 18-21, but has not modified the basis of rejection of claims 17 and 22, even though those claims are dependent from claims 13 and 18, respectively. The Applicants will treat the Examiner's rejection of claims 17 and 22 as though they were rejected as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Alkhatib, Lim and Taylor.

For completeness herein, the Applicants will repeat their previously-submitted arguments which specifically distinguished claim 13 over the teachings of Sitaraman and Alkhatib, with added comments to point out where the Examiner has failed to address the points of those arguments and failed to establish how the teachings of Lim overcome the deficiencies identified by Applicants in the teachings of Sitaraman and Alkhatib.

The Applicants' invention is directed to preventing the illegitimate use of an Internet Protocol (IP) address in an IP network, commonly referred to as "spoofing." The novel method includes providing a filter in a switch node through which a subscriber device accesses the IP network. The switch node maintains a list of trusted DHCP servers which are conventionally used to assign an IP address to subscriber devices. When the switch node receives a DHCP request for an IP address from a subscriber device, the switch node examines the reply message that carries the assigned subscriber IP address and analyzes it to confirm it has a source address from one of the trusted DHCP servers. The switch node then dynamically updates the filter and stores an identification of the

Appl. No. 10/531,753
Amdt. Dated June 1, 2009
Reply to Office action of March 31, 2009
Attorney Docket No. P17299-US1
EUS/GJ/P/09-1127

subscriber device and the assigned IP address. Subsequently, when the subscriber device transmits a frame using a source IP address, the switch node confirms in the filter that the source IP address of the frame matches the stored subscriber IP address and, if not, the switch node discards the frame. **That combination of functions is not taught or suggested by the teachings of Sitaraman, Alkhatib and Lim, either individually or in combination.**

With respect to the claim limitation "creating a list of trusted ones of the DHCP servers in said switch node," the Examiner again refers generally to Sitaraman as disclosing, in Figure 2, "multiple DHCP servers." The Examiner, however, does not point to any teaching in Sitaraman, or Alkhatib, of creating a list of trusted ones of the DHCP servers, or the storing such a list in the switch node through which a subscriber device accesses the IP network. Moreover, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Lim of that claim limitation.

With respect to the claim limitation "analysing the reply message [by said switch node] to be a DHCP message and having a source address from one of the trusted DHCP servers," the Examiner states that Sitaraman teaches a client that may decide to "accept [an offered IP address] or wait for additional offers from other DHCP servers on the network." That claim limitation now recites that the function is performed in the switch node and not the subscriber device (*i.e.*, the client). In either case, the Examiner does not point to any teaching in Sitaraman of analyzing a DHCP reply message to ensure that its source address is from a trusted one of the DHCP servers maintained in a list by the switch node. Similarly, if Sitaraman does not teach creating a filter list of trusted DHCP servers in a switch node, nor analyzing a reply message to be a DHCP message having a source address from one of the trusted DHCP servers, it cannot logically teach the claim limitation of "updating a filter dynamically in the switch node, the filter storing an identification of the subscriber device and the assigned subscriber IP address," which the Examiner asserts is taught at column 10, lines 27-31. The Applicants have examined the referenced portion of Sitaraman and find no such teaching. Moreover, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Lim of that claim limitation.

Appl. No. 10/531,753
Amdt. Dated June 1, 2009
Reply to Office action of March 31, 2009
Attorney Docket No. P17299-US1
EUS/GJ/P/09-1127

With respect to the claim limitation "comparing in the filter said source IP address with the stored subscriber IP address," the Examiner states that Sitaraman teaches "dynamic" IP addresses are compared with static IP addresses," referring to column 4, lines 10-14. The claim limitation, however, read in the context of the whole claim, is comparing a source IP address of a frame from a subscriber device with a previously-stored IP address assigned to the subscriber device, in order to ensure the subscriber device is not "spoofing" an IP address not assigned to the device. Thus, the claim limitation is not comparing a dynamic IP address to a static IP address as the Examiner reads the teachings of Sitaraman. Moreover, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Lim of that claim limitation.

The Examiner does recognize that Sitaraman fails to teach discarding a frame from a subscriber device when its source IP address differs from the stored subscriber IP address. The mere fact that the Examiner recognizes this deficiency in the teaching of Sitaraman should, as a logical matter, counter against his assertion that Sitaraman teaches the claim limitation of "comparing in the filter said source IP address with the stored subscriber IP address." The logical purpose of such comparison is to determine whether or not such addresses are the same and, thus, if they are not, the frame should be discarded – the very function which the Examiner recognizes Sitaraman fails to teach. In either case, the Examiner looks to the teachings of Alkhatib to overcome the acknowledged deficiency. Alkhatib, however, fails to teach discarding, by a switch node, a frame transmitted by a subscriber device when the source IP address for the frame does not correspond to a previously-stored IP address assigned to the subscriber device. The Examiner points to paragraph 149 of Alkhatib as teaching this single limitation of claim 13. According to the teachings of Alkhatib, entities 14, 16 and 18 are devices such as "mobile and non-mobile computing devices," which correspond to the "subscriber device" as used in claim 13, and those devices are connected to an IP network through a Network Address Translation (NAT) device 12. (see Figure 1). Alkhatib is directed to a system for accessing an entity inside a private network. According to the teachings of paragraph 149, "[i]f NAT 12 checks the source IP address in incoming packets, rejecting those in which the source IP address is different than the destination IP address for which the connection was

Appl. No. 10/531,753
Amdt. Dated June 1, 2009
Reply to Office action of March 31, 2009
Attorney Docket No. P17299-US1
EUS/GJ/P/09-1127

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 01 2009

established in the first place." The purpose of that function in Alkhatib is to control access to the devices 14, 16 and 18 *in* the private network behind the NAT 12, not to ensure that source IP address utilized by such devices matches an IP address previously-assigned to such devices. Therefore, the Examiner's reliance on the teachings of Alkhatib is inapposite and fails to cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Sitaraman. Moreover, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Lim of that claim limitation.

Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviosuness of claim 13 in view of Sitaraman, Alkhatib and Lim. Whereas independent claim 18 recites limitations analogous to those of claim 13, it is also not obvious over Sitaraman in view of Alkhatib. Furthermore, whereas claims 14-17 and 19-22 are dependent from claims 13 and 18, respectively, and include the limitations thereof, they are also not obvious in view of those references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 13-22.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: June 1, 2009
Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com